



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

522); another, a "Notable Eulogy" on Lincoln, delivered in Pittsburgh, which Arnold, the friend and biographer of its subject, called "a grand lyric", and confessed that he read the peroration "amidst blinding tears" (II. 553); a third, on "Reconstruction", delivered in the House in 1866 (covering sixty-two pages of the book); and a fourth, his "Great Final Argument", as one of the managers of the impeachment of President Johnson, which was followed by the invariable avalanche of praise.

Nevertheless, we venture the prediction that Thomas Williams will not be remembered on account of his "notable orations". Despite "the lofty march of their periods", they no longer have any real life. He will be remembered, if remembered at all, not for what he said, but for what he did: for the leading part he took in the enactment of the short-lived Tenure-of-Office Act which furnished at last the pretext for the impeachment he had advocated, with all the fiery rhetoric at his command and on more substantial grounds, but until then without success; and, more particularly, for his share in the concoction of its famous proviso, which in the end, to the deep discomfiture of its contrivers, made possible the acquittal of the object of so much Ciceronian invective.

DAVID MILLER DEWITT.

A History of the Civil War in the United States, 1861-5. By Lieutenant W. BIRKBECK WOOD, M.A., and Major J. E. EDMONDS, R.E., with an introduction by SPENSER WILKINSON. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Methuen and Company. 1905. Pp. xxii, 549, with thirteen maps and eleven plans.)

THIS book, written by English military men, presumably young (since they describe themselves in the preface as attending recent lectures at the Staff College), is plainly the work of well-educated soldiers. It appears to be especially intended for the use of cadets. Though not so technical as to embarrass the general reader, the book is strictly military, making no further reference to matters civil and political than is necessary to a good understanding of the campaigns. It does not appear that the authors have made a personal study of the fields they describe, or, indeed, that they have ever visited America. The list of authorities to which they refer is rather meagre in view of the extent of the literature relating to the Civil War. Yet the authorities are excellent and have been carefully studied. There is no lack of intelligent comprehension of the events described, and the presentment is simple and direct.

By an odd dislocation the accounts of naval operations are given in a single chapter at the end of the book, the main narrative of events containing the scantiest possible mention of the work of the fleets. In the opinion of many men, both North and South, the navy was even more effective than the army in crushing the Confederacy. Its work was at any rate in the highest degree important, and to relegate the

record of it to the background is ungracious and inappropriate. In many actions of the war the operations of army and navy were intertwined like two strands of the same rope, and cannot be separated in the telling without violence. It is hard to account for so singular an arrangement, unless we take it that the authors, having in view as readers army men, felt that the navy might be postponed as having inferior interest.

In the history of our Civil War there are many points upon which men, whether critics or participants, have never agreed, and perhaps never will agree. Messrs. Wood and Edmonds judge without fear or favor as to the merits of commanders and give chapter and verse for their conclusions. In some of these we do not coincide, but shall take up here but one case. The Seven Days' campaign of 1862 before Richmond is described as "of immense value to the Confederate cause, because it established on a sure basis Lee's reputation as a commander in the field" (p. 80). Set over against this statement that of "Dick" Taylor, a Confederate lieutenant-general, an able soldier, a participant in the campaign, and a devoted friend of Lee. In his *Destruction and Reconstruction* (1879) occurs the statement (p. 86) that the Seven Days' campaign from Mechanicsville to Malvern Hill inclusive "was nothing but a series of blunders, one after another, and all huge".

Since McClellan was kept out of Richmond, the campaign in general must be held to have resulted in favor of the Confederates. But examining the details we find on their side much shortcoming. There was little disparity of numbers between the two sides. Of the series of great battles, but one, Gaines's Mill, was a victory for Lee; all the rest were distinctly defeats. Messrs. Wood and Edmonds repeat the familiar slur, that "Lee read McClellan like an open book" (p. 69). Certainly Lee did not read McClellan when, on June 28, believing that the Federals would retreat down the Peninsula, he detached Ewell's corps and his cavalry under Stuart on a wild-goose chase to the east. Between June 26 and July 1 Lee underwent four defeats: at Savage's Station he failed to embarrass the Federal retreat by Magruder's attack; at Glendale Longstreet and A. P. Hill failed to gain the Quaker road along which the main Federal army retired unassailed. At Mechanicsville and Malvern Hill occurred two of the most disastrous and sanguinary repulses of the entire war. In Lieutenant-general Taylor's opinion these misfortunes were largely due to ignorance on the part of the Confederates of the topography of the country. Though within a few miles of Richmond, neither Lee, nor Johnston before him, had caused it to be explored or mapped; while to the Federals it was accurately known. At the end, though Richmond remained uncaptured, Lee had lost in killed and wounded twice as many as his foe; and but for the inertia of McClellan, who however had shown ability of a high order during his change of base, might have been put to rout.

Of this poor showing for the Confederates Messrs. Wood and Edmonds are well aware, detailing with entire correctness the failures

just described. But how can it be claimed that the Seven Days' campaign established Lee's reputation as a commander? The campaign rather showed that Lee, although bold and brave, had yet much to learn in the handling of a great army. However it may be with poets, generals are made rather than born; or, at any rate, to the natural gift experience must be added in order to bring to pass the perfect soldier. This seems to have been true even in the case of a genius as marked as Lee. The Seven Days' campaign was 'prentice work, not that of a passed master in the art of war such as he afterward became.

Though one may here and there find fault with the work of Messrs. Wood and Edmonds, the book is nevertheless a good military account of our Civil War—impartial, painstaking, intelligent. The authors claim to be disciples of Colonel G. F. R. Henderson, one of the most capable and best instructed of our recent military critics, and the earlier chapters of the volume passed, before his death, under his review. The writers have sat at his feet to good purpose and do their teacher credit.

J. K. HOSMER.

James Gillespie Blaine. By EDWARD STANWOOD. [American Statesmen, Second Series.] (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1905. Pp. ii, 377.)

ONE could wish to find the editor of the second American Statesmen series proposing, as one of its objects, the correction of certain omissions from the first. It is hard to see why a gallery of statesmen which includes Calhoun should leave out Jefferson Davis, why it should include Benton and leave out Stephen A. Douglas, why it should include Charles Francis Adams and leave out Garrison. But one infers from the choice of Blaine for the initial number that the editor of the second series (whose identity, by the way, is not disclosed) means it to deal only with men whose careers belong chiefly to the years since Reconstruction.

To write of Blaine is still to provoke controversy, but it is also to arouse interest—at least, among those readers who can remember what a peculiar place Blaine long held in the affections of thousands of thoroughgoing Republicans, and how peculiarly exasperating some other Americans found him. Mr. Stanwood was perhaps better equipped for the work than any other writer in the country. He knew Blaine well—with an intimacy, it appears, passing that of ordinary friendship—and they were closely connected by marriage. He is himself a Maine man. He is a close student of party history. He is a good Republican. He keeps his faith in the man he writes about—an attitude always conducive to the interest of biography. Yet he excels, on the other hand, in the kind of fairness that consists in treating respectfully the men and views one opposes.

He is, one occasionally feels, somewhat at pains to demonstrate his freedom from partizanship by criticizing certain of Blaine's acts and dissenting pointedly from certain of his opinions. For instance, in